

Humanist *World Digest*

VOL. 27, No. 2
MAY, 1955

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

Who -- What Will Stop Me?

By John Malick

Americans for the World

By William E. Zeuch

'Little Red Riding Hood' Humanism

By Kenneth Starr Brown

NEWS AND VIEWS

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

PUBLISHED BY THE HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP,
INCORPORATED IN CALIFORNIA AS A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
FOR EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thrall of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)
HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

E. O. Corson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Sena Bondelie, Dr. Phillip B. Oliver, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Sena Bondelie, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman, and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rates: 1.00 per year. Advertising Rates: As space as available; classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 27, No. 2, April-May-June, 1955. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

WHO—WHAT WILL STOP ME?

By John Malick

We note that you are asking contributions on, "A Universal Moral Code." The situation at which we have arrived is new to history. There is practically no restraint left that gives even pause to the evil doer, small or large size. As long as there is record there has been something believed that would keep hands off things and people, or else. Disregard it and something dreadful would happen now or later. The thing believed in may have been wholly imaginary, usually was, but effective as long as believed. The upper bracket sinners, the big operators, who make a difference in our life, personal, national and international, do not believe that anything will catch up with them but we do know the devices that have been used up to this time. We have brought together the major ways chronologically: "Mustn't Touch—Taboo"; "Parents-Ancestors Wouldn't Like it—The Dead Hand"; "Might Be Incarcerated—Jail—Hell"; "Might Backfire On You—Reap As Sow—Karma."

In a way it is a marvel that people are as generally well behaved as they are. This seems more of a marvel since evolution became the key. When it was believed that man had fallen from a perfect condition then it was easy to account for whatever decency he had in him. It was part of the original good that he had not yet wormed out of himself. Now it is certain that man's background was violence, in obedience to the jungle code, "You get only what you can take and keep." There was no kind of life on the earth from which good behavior in the human sense could be had by imitation. One well-behaved animal is a very late novelty. One kind of animal **reached** a normal of being well behaved while all other animals **kept** the normal of never being well behaved. Keeping in order is now the normal. Most misbehaving is printed and it does not take the whole sheet. Winston Churchill says that you cannot imagine one Eng-

lish town falling upon another town with violence. This is a condition for which man is wholly responsible. The credit is all his. He was not started that way.

"Mustn't Touch—Taboo." The first way that scared people into keeping their hands off things and people went on long before there was record. Out in the Pacific Islands this oldest way was found still operating. The word "taboo" comes from there. It was the time when magic ruled and it **did** rule. You touched things at your peril that were protected by magic. Likely no police force was ever as 100% efficient. It was perfectly safe to leave things lying around by the roadside. Naturally, those who knew how to do it were the men of distinction. They had to have something to throw over a territory to protect their game and fish. You could beat the game warden but not that something that made a thing taboo. It put the kind of fear into people that keeps them away from a haunted house or from a graveyard at night. In the first human stages it must have been difficult to keep people in order. They were more like monkeys, always monkeying with things, or like children who have to touch everything around. They could not have had a police force large enough to keep hands off things. They had no jails. It was all they could do to get food and under cover for themselves without having to house and feed prisoners.

Magic had the advantage that you could do it yourself if you had to. Somebody took the blacksmith's tools. The mud was gathered up in which the thief had left a footprint. It was wrapped in a banana skin and put into the coals on the forge. The blacksmith had to do it just right and say just the right words, "You have stolen my tools. May you swell up like a tree and burst like a worm in the fire." This would fix him. Then one watched around town to see who had a swelling and you had your man. He would just waste away, no boarding him in jail, no paying a police force, no court costs. It got around by their form of grapevine. After that his tools were safer than under Pinkerton protection. Or you wanted to do something to somebody. When he was not looking you picked up a crumb of his food. In magic that was really part of him and what you did with the crumb you did to him. The crumb dried up and the man from whom you took it dried up, too. He didn't even know that you had it.

Magic of course could be effective only as long as people believed it. After a while some of the most adventurous touched

the taboo thing and found that nothing happened to them. It was bound to go out when people ceased to believe in it but it must have given training in restraint when there was nothing else. Conscience was not yet functioning and religion had not yet concerned itself with morality. As late as the Greeks the priest was not thought of as being any more responsible for conduct than was any other profession. But magic was too effective in making people behave to be allowed to go out all at once. As long as there were people left who believed in it there would be those who would use it as the easiest and cheapest way of keeping people in order. Naturally, much of it was taken over by religion. Magic still peeps out at many points in contemporary religious systems. Things still happen that are pure magic. What is left of magic now is sacrosanct through its religious connection and is no longer called magic. It has acquired the standing of revealed knowledge. In the world of real knowledge magic now has no place.

"Parents - Ancestors Wouldn't Like It—The Dead Hand." Some place along the line the immediate parents, and their parents, and on back, all the ancestors, came to be a very effective way of making people behave. There was a very long period when the father and the mother were not in authority. The clan could not risk the responsibility of having parents the sole authority for managing the children. Whatever was done by anyone affected the whole clan. When children misbehaved it was the whole group that was responsible for punishing them. The Old Testament gives specific directions about what to do with a stubborn son. He was taken out to the gate of the city and the whole group stoned him. This time before parents acquired full control of their children is left over in spots. There is little parental discipline among the Eskimos. A thousand years before Moses, Hammurabi's code had among its three hundred commands one about not striking parents. The punishment was cutting off the striking hand. By the time of Moses a command was given about **honoring** parents. Something in the way of benefit was added. One would live a long time and prosper. Moses' command had a much better press and became one of the Ten Commandments that must have been ten of the most pressing social problems of the time. A reward for honoring parents replaced cutting off the hand. What Moses said acquired authority by lifting it from a local custom to a divine command. Honoring parents ceased to be just a good local prac-

tice and became a direct command of the local gods they believed in at the time. Few people have ever heard of Hammurabi's code while half the planet knows about Moses.

Something else operated in the past that has no influence now. They believed that dead parents and ancestors are still connected. There is something that you can do for **them** and there is something they can do **for** you and **against** you. The live parent soon became the dead ancestor. Children would watch their steps in dealing with parents when they were old. In their next stage they would be with the dead and could be very troublesome or very helpful. This dead hand is no longer a force in the Western Hemisphere. Any threat such as, "What I will do to you when I am dead," would have no restraining effect whatever now. It would only suggest a mental case for the healer or some kind of institution. This is all that remains of a force that for many long centuries made people behave. It still holds over part of the earth where it has been lifted to the dignity of ancestor worship.

"Incarceration—Jail and Hell." One of the ways to keep people in order was to shut them up. Jails naturally came very late and never could hold very many. It was a strange assortment that got into the first jail: the really bad actor, the insane who were thought guilty in some way, and debtors. Jails housed those less than normal in conduct as well as those more than normal in intelligence and courage. Those trying to decorate the family tree always take a chance in looking up the jailbird ancestors. They may run into a criminal or some pioneer to whom it is a credit to be related. Those who have something to say often had their first chance to write when put in jail. Debtors were put in. The idea seemed to be to discourage over-buying. This has been corrected now with all the pressure to "use while you pay," and get the signature on the dotted line. Jails never could be effective in a large way. It was easy to fill them and embarrass the law. The French syndicalists and the I.W.W. both used this technique in filling the jails with their fellows.

Something much cheaper in the way of incarceration was needed. Giving a long time, or an all-time, sentence after death was thought up. There is speculation about who thought of it first. It seems such a brilliant, effective and cheap way of keeping people in order that it was thought to come from God himself. It seems unnecessary to go to such high authority to account for this imprisonment after death. It is a quite natural and human

thing to think of by those who have to keep people in order who believe anything that is told them. All degrees and varieties of hell are all too human. Even very decent people feel now and then that a short or long prison term after death would be about right for a number of people they know. Imprisonment after death, like magic, is wholly imaginative. It is effective only as long as there are those who believe in it. No one has ever come back to say that he did or did not have to serve out the whole sentence. To make the shaky, imaginative thing hold at all it had to be lifted from uncertain opinion to revealed fact. For a long time all who did not believe it were jailed. Those who would have spurned eternal imprisonment as a device of exploiting man came to believe in it when it arrived at the status of a revelation from God. For 1600 years the only church in Europe used this scarehead to keep the barbarians in order. They tempered the harshness of it with a purgatorial probation period. Most came through and escaped incarceration in hell. At the time of the Reformation this was checked with Scripture and found without authority. Too many got through to the happier dead. This seemed a Biblical scandal. The reformers did away with the purgatorial period which they said let through many that the god of the time wanted to serve out the whole eternal sentence. This gave a powerful leverage for recruiting the churches. The hour of final decision had to be before death. By all the estimates from Protestant sources hell was tremendously enlarged at the time of the Reformation. This eternal sentence now is having its renaissance with revivalism become big business on its own.

"It Might Backfire on You—Reap As You Sow—Karma." The most desirable thing naturally is some system that would wipe out all the results of bad conduct so that one could forget it. The earliest way was to clear up the whole thing by the use of blood, animal or human. Or the sins might be loaded on an animal and driven into the wilderness. This became later the belief in a universal burden bearer who would pick up and carry all the results of all the wrong-doing of the human race. A plebiscite over most of the centuries would show this to be the popular belief. The Western Hemisphere finally settled into the belief that the results of wrong-doing are settled for in a place, to which one is sentenced. The other half of the planet said that the wrongdoer does not go into a place but into a condition after death. In this view, punishment, if you call

it that, is not a place to which you are sentenced but a condition into which you arrive, wherever the dead go. What salvation he has is what he has brought along with him. This is the belief that here or any time later you reap what you sow. It is a highly responsible doctrine and naturally unpopular. As the doctrine of Karma it became effective in the Orient but has never been believed in the Western Hemisphere.

Part of the world took the "reap-as-you-sow" seriously. It said that one's life is a long process, before this life, in this life and the after stages. They said that the effects of all kinds of conduct are cumulative. One builds up results from conduct in this life and goes on under the same law of sequence, cause and effect in conduct. That is, one will always be running into himself, the reward or punishment made **for himself by himself**. This does not sound very dramatic or tragic. One wonders how it ever affected people's conduct at all. They had to put it concretely in the vernacular. Just how did they put it to keep people from lying to the teacher or selling the game to a fixer? They said that for lying to your teacher you were slaying 14 people, seven ancients before you and seven posterity after you. They thought that you were in for a lot of trouble by disposing of that many before you and after you. Or they put it this way. If you do this you will have to go through as many lives as animals as there are hairs on the back of an animal.

Here put into the vernacular crudely is a great idea. It would seem that it ought to be true if it is not. It says that wherever you go just what you are is all that you have to be saved, and you have made it much or little. This is high and responsible talk, this doctrine of reaping what you sow. One wishes that those in high places in the Western world believed it. It might give them pause in a number of kinds of skull-duggery of different sizes that they do without the least feeling of being restrained by the wash-your-sins-away system. This redemptive system is operative in Europe, North America, South America and Australia. If someone else takes responsibility for the offense and offender, naturally the wrongdoer will not be very careful about his conduct. A system that washes sins away takes all the force out of the ethical command. All the major religions are old. Not one of them has authority or vitality enough to deal effectively with individual and collective wrong-doing in its territory. The reap-as-you-sow belief restrains over half the planet but not enough to affect the large size wrongdoers who make

the social mess under Hinduism, Mohammedanism, Confucianism and Shintoism.

There are three possible beliefs that might affect conduct. One might believe that a personal God is interested in people going straight. He would issue a code such as the Ten Commandments or the words of Jesus. In the second place one might believe in an impersonal universe whose laws would automatically and impersonally punish the wrongdoer. In the third place all the restraints in conduct might be from what people think or would do in the way of rewarding or punishing. It is likely that the commands of the personal God will in time be wholly ineffective. The new universe seems to show no interest in or preference for the different kinds of conduct. It seems likely that the only final restraint will be in the humanist field, the impact of people on people. This is a slow and long-range process. It will take a long time to affect visibly those long conditioned by the old restraints. Most of them have lost their old word of command and the new humanist responsibility affects only a minority.

At this stage most people want to be immortal with the happy dead. What is needed practically is a system of salvation based on conduct so that one has to be a certain kind of person to win through to the condition that he wants to reach for the long time after this stage. In the Western Hemisphere the sow-as-you-reap idea is mentioned approvingly but is never stressed and is not believed. It might affect irresponsible wrong-doing on our half the planet if this idea of having to bear the effects of your conduct could be worked in by the revivalists and the decorous churches. The only test of wrong we know is what is done to people, the degree of hurt and the number affected. By this test the corruption of our cities was likely the worst wrong-doing of our time. This evil was done by impeccable churchmen who had a clean bill of health for this life and a security card for the next from their churches. New York City was robbed by models of personal morality, the husband of one wife, abstainers, conscientious keepers of the church code and faithful attendants. The evildoers were finally thrown out by secular or the humanist kind of forces. The churches added little even in the way of condemnation of the evil. Other bad actors of large size operated with equal freedom in the industrial and labor fields.

James A. Farley has just acknowledged the guilt and moral ineffectiveness of his own group. We have waited in vain for this confession from churchmen. Mr. Farley says, "It must be

recognized that politics and morality are one and indivisible. In recent scandals involving men in public life the identification of Catholics among the betrayers of trust came so often as to bring us a heavy sense of shame." And this. We have been wondering about it for a long time: "We would be something less than honest if we did not recognize that many of the most notorious political machines in America have been built by Catholics and operated by Catholics." Other religious bodies have been equally indifferent to the evil done by their people. The Catholic is the largest of the Christian groups. It is thought to exercise most influence over the consciences and the conduct of its people. We cite it as an example of the failure of the Christian theological system at its largest to restrain the conduct that really does the hurt.

* * *

AMERICANS FOR THE WORLD

By William Edward Zeuch

We had thought that isolationism was just about dead in this country and ready to be buried but, like the proverbial cat, it seems to have nine lives. Again the Little Americans are raising the hue and cry of America For The Americans.

In our steadily shrinking world, every day made smaller and smaller by faster planes and new speed records, isolationism is an anachronism. It is not only that thousand-mile-an-hour jets have reduced time-space relationships on this shrivelling globe of ours but also that many other things, such as international economic interdependence, have been working to make Little Americanism, as well as many other such dated provincial notions, obsolete.

History teaches us, if it teaches us anything, that it is suicidal for any nation to be rich and unprotected, or inadequately protected. It has been in the past, and still is, an invitation to invasion and pillage by every neighboring poorer overpopulated country. Almost every great power or advanced civilization down through history fell a victim to such plundering marauders. Nowadays, due to technological advances, it is impossible for any nation, no matter how rich, to protect itself.

The only real defense for any country is to make the whole world one. This means not only an equating of limited sovereignty but a sharing of the world's resources according to need. What we must have at present is not armed-to-the-teeth preparedness but a world program of mutual helpfulness on some

honorable qu'il-pro-quo basis. Americans will save and maintain all that is worth while in our favored land by an Americans-For-the-World program rather than by following a narrow, self-centered America-For-Americans policy.

Because we are, temporarily at least, the richest and the most powerful nation in the world, we Americans are in a most advantageous position to determine what our one world shall be. There are conditions which we do not want in our world of tomorrow. We can lay down requirements so as to eliminate what we do not want in the future world civilization.

For example, as we view older civilizations that have endured into the present era, we see that most of them are cursed with inadequate resources and overpopulation. Millions starve to death every year in China and India and hundreds of millions live in a perpetual state of malnutrition. The actually developed resources of those nations, regardless of what their potential resources may be, are not sufficient to feed their people. Yet their people continue to bring forth young as thoughtlessly and as unrestrainedly as animals.

One condition of sharing our abundant resources might well be that every overpopulated country adopt a program of population control whereby numbers shall be reduced to the point where developed resources will provide a decent standard of living for every individual.

There is absolutely no virtue in quantity or volume of population, particularly when it is diseased, starved, and ignorant. Rather, the virtue of any people is in its quality, that is, in its health, its intelligence, its well-being—all of which depend primarily upon an adequate standard of living.

We would be foolish, indeed, to share our resources with any peoples who would not cooperate fully in such a program of population limitation. On any other basis we would be sharing merely to increase human misery. We must avoid, too, all suggested trick solutions for the population problem.

Just recently a writer claims that overpopulation is due to starvation on a starch diet which combination, he claims, increases fertility. This may be true or false, no one knows for sure, but even if it is true he offers no way whereby the starving millions may get onto a well-fed, protein diet which he insists is necessary to achieve a reduced birth rate.

If the quantity of population is kept well within ability to maintain at a decent standard of living, and we have all the

knowledge needed to make such limitation effective, and if we do all within our power to improve the quality of that population, we will not only lift world civilization to higher levels but we will also be reducing those population pressures that have been one of the main causes of armed aggression all down through the ages.

We who are Americans-For-The-World must do everything we can to make the United States a real force for a better world. We must not share thoughtlessly as one throws alms to a crowd of beggars without regard as to where the alms fall or the effect of such hit and miss charity.

On the other hand we should not shut off ourselves from the world, which would be foolish and futile in any event, and hogishly try to keep all of our good fortune to ourselves. Rather, we should be stewards of our good fortune for the good of the world.

An American world policy along these lines would be one that the rest of the world could understand. Such a program could be coupled with a drive for complete world disarmament. The less the world spends on weapons for killing the more it would have for such constructive developments as would help to raise standards of living. All peoples could understand such a policy.

They would then bless us for our constructive leadership rather than curse us for our atomic threats. The United States would then set an example for the world rather than try to awe it with show of atomic power.

What we could do to win the world for abundance and peace if we spent in constructive ways what we waste on wars and preparation for wars!!!

* * *

"LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD" HUMANISM

By Kenneth Starr Brown

(Formerly National Group Organizer and Counselor of the American Humanist Association)

Humanists believe that this one life of which we are certain can be improved democratically by man through the use of science, reason, and good will. "Humanism must beware of dogma," they say. "It must be permitted to develop in the same way that a maturing individual is free to change his views when new facts become available." So far so good.

But then there is a tendency to jump to the conclusion that,

"The whole world is waiting to embrace Humanism. Soon it will unite all nations in a spirit of love and understanding." Such an attitude is dangerous because it is not necessarily true and may blind us to barriers confronting the growth of Humanism. It indicates that some of us are still in the "Little Red Riding Hood" stage of Humanist thinking.

Let us remember that progress is not always continuous. Humanism has emerged many times before, only to be engulfed by ignorance and pushed into the background. The Oration of Pericles was Humanistic; so was the spirit of the Renaissance. Yet Humanism today is one of the world's best-kept secrets.

Forces of unreason breed quickly in the climate of despair and self-doubt in which mankind lives today. Confused, groping people everywhere are asking, "What can we believe?" One answer, of course, is Humanism. But the people cannot hear our feeble answer. We are drowned out by Billy Graham and others of like calibre who are employing TV, radio and press to sow seeds of helplessness and guilt complex throughout the world.

Observe the current popularity of despair in art, literature, and drama. Boiled down, this gloomy existentialism expresses the attitude of, "What's the use of trying to improve this crummy world?"

Let's face it. With few exceptions, man's religions, economic systems, and governments have failed him.

Christianity is based upon the ridiculous story of man's "fall" and subsequent need of redemption. Remove this superstition and Christianity will collapse like a tent with a broken center pole. Naturally, Christianity and other supernaturalistic faiths—which are largely based upon the idea that priests should do man's thinking for him—have been and will be concerned with cruelly corroding men's minds so that they will continue to be ignorant, confused, and pliable.

Communism was at one time the hope of both the underprivileged and the intellectual. Now it is ruthlessly violating one of Humanism's main ideals, the importance and dignity of each and every human being.

Capitalism has made us too competitive and has encouraged an unfair distribution of wealth. Man has no self-confidence in his ability to create a better world. He is frightened of the sunlit dawn now dimly visible. Organized ignorance naturally encourages this sense of inferiority which prevents man from acting

to defend himself against authoritarian religion, overpopulation, and possible extinction.

Possibly we Humanists have not accomplished more because we also lack confidence in ourselves—and in addition lack realism. Hector Hawton writes, in referring to his earlier Humanist experiences, "Many of us are discovering now that we cheated ourselves. We were intoxicated with mere words. We built a castle in the clouds, but we never really expected to live in it." *1

We cannot introduce Humanism to the world by hoping for it any more than we can by praying for it. Nor are aloof, competitive intellectuals, demonstrating their vocabularies and egos in occasional Mutual Admiration Society meetings, contributing much to this, the greatest revolution the world has ever experienced. We have plenty of architects; now we need some bricklayers.

We must take a realistic view of the forces which oppose us and the weapons they employ. We must stop slinking around corners and proudly declare our Humanist beliefs. Liberals are often thought of as being foolish "do-gooders"—and probably also slightly subversive—only because we fail to correct these misconceptions. Above all, we must have faith in ourselves and in our ability to successfully attack the forces of unreason which would toss us back into the stagnant pool from which we have crawled.

But how can we aid the cause of Humanism?

By rolling snowballs.

An individual can practice and study Humanism, introduce his friends to it, cooperate with organizations working for Humanist goals, bombard the press with humanist letters to the editor and request booksellers and librarians to order and display Humanist books, and join and contribute as much as possible to an active Humanist organization. He may start a local Humanist group. Local radio spot announcements and news-Humanist group. Local radio spot announcements and news-can be afforded.

A large Humanist organization can publish a magazine, recruit subscribers and members by means of mass-communicated lectures, programs, articles and ads, provide a cross-fertilization of ideas among individuals and other Humanist or educational groups throughout the world, and awaken dormant human beings

*1 p. 24, *The Feast of Unreason*, Watts & Co., London, England.

everywhere to the possibilities of attaining a higher degree of self-realization here and now.

Individuals, liberal organizations, foundations, The United Nations, etc., can work for such world aims as peace, planned parenthood, better schools and other public institutions, civil rights, social security, improved medical care, separation of church and state, and the conservation of man and the natural resources upon which his existence depends. Legislation through education is one method of attaining these goals.

Unitarianism, if it can overcome a tendency to be too respectable, can introduce Humanism throughout the world faster and more effectively than any other organization now on the scene. Its intellectual freedom is like a refreshing breeze. But Unitarians, like the Humanists, must first learn to use mass means of communication effectively.

Whatever religious affiliation you may have, if you are sympathetic with the ideals of Humanism and realize the desperate need we have of cooperation in the world today, **do** something about it; it is doubtful that you will pass this way again.

* * *

OUT OF THE CAVE

At a recent meeting in St. Louis of scientists, theologians and philosophers, a stark but simple statement was made. This statement was easily the most important thing said during our lifetime.

The statement was to the effect that the United States and Soviet Russia, between them, now possess more than the number of fission and fusion bombs required to burn off all forms of life on this planet.

It was also pointed out that responsible leaders of government have served public notice that nothing would be held back in the event of war. And, in order that no one might make the mistake of thinking that any of this was academic, the group was reminded that some of our highly-placed military men, regarding war as inevitable and not wishing to be placed at a later disadvantage, had urged that the United States touch off the holocaust by dropping the first bombload ourselves.

There is, however, something far more horrible than the fact that the means are now at hand for the total extermination of life. Far more horrible and pulverizing is the possibility that the scientists may be wrong and that humankind could survive the next war. In all the speculation over the possibility of extinction,

the more dreadful prospect of fragmentary survival has been overlooked. It may be that only eighty or a hundred million Americans would lose their lives in such a war, out of a total of one billion or more for the entire world. What would they use for cities? What would they use for food?

In the early months following the announcement of the first atomic attack on human flesh, stories sprang up about the hideous by-products of radioactivity. There were wild guesses about the effects on human genes. There were visions of future generations of freaks that would be the legacy of another war. And in those early months following Hiroshima the American Government correctly repudiated such somber speculation. But with the hydrogen and cobalt bombs no Government can any longer say that radioactivity in another war can be controlled or that the human genes can somehow be shielded from the mangling effects of radioactive bullets let loose in large quantities.

The Government cannot provide such reassurance because there is no such reassurance to be had. All the Government can do is to confine itself to what is certain: That all civilization and its works would be leveled in an atomic war. It is left to others to guess whether man would go down with society or, in the event that man did survive, exactly what life would mean under those circumstances. Will mere survival mean that the human species will at last have cured itself of its intelligence, the highest manifestation of which was its skill in overcoming nature's congeniality to man? And what about the phrase so favored by philosophers and theologians to describe the preciousness of the individual—the dignity of man? This human uniqueness so venerated in Church and story—what form will it take? Will it be the uniqueness of the mumbling and helpless idiot foraging to sustain a senseless life?

These things are not the scare stories or aberrations of the total nightmare. They are the products of an onrushing reality. They are as real as your anticipation of the next paycheck; as real as the house you are getting ready to build; as real as the family reunion at Thanksgiving; as real as the newspaper in your hand that gives so many examples of the differences among men that divide them and frighten them and very little about the common destiny that should inspire them.

But there is a tendency to dismiss the dreadful because of its very universality: If the tragedy involves enough people, apparently, it ceases to be tragedy.

But suppose that you, the individual, should survive? Of what will your escape then be fashioned?

The rights of the state are many. They include the right to sacrifice human life or to take human life in the defense of the nation. But there is nothing in the political rights of the state or its rulers that includes the right to strike at the nature of man or to disfigure the face of man or to toy with the vital balances that make life possible. For if the state has political rights man also has natural rights. These natural rights are above the rights of the state and beyond the reach and the authority of the state. The good society exists to serve and protect these rights. Man has a right to keep himself from being cheapened, debased, or deformed. He has a right to creative growth. He has a right to individual sanctity and sovereignty. He has a right to make life purposeful. If these natural rights should die, though human flesh in some form remain, then the survivors will not be the lucky ones.

To discuss all this by referring solely to the threat of Communist Russia is to dramatize folly. Communism becomes dangerous not only because of its own aims and means, but because of our own inability to grasp the problem at its largest. When we see that our highest purpose and greatest security rest in championing the natural rights of man in the world, and when we define the working basis of peace and freedom, Communism will have no place to go.

Despite the many categories of the historian, there are only two ages of man. The first age, the age from the beginnings of recorded time to the present, is the age of the cave man. It is the age of war. It is today. The second age, still only a prospect, is the age of civilized man. The test of civilized man will be represented by his ability to use his inventiveness for his own good by substituting world law for world anarchy. That second age is still within the reach of the individual in our time. It is not a part-time job, however. It calls for total awareness, total commitment.

—Norman Cousins, *The Saturday Review*

* * *

People of European origin increased more than twice as fast as non-Europeans between 1650 and 1950, growing from about 100 million to 800 million, while the non-European population in the world grew only from 445 million to 1,600 million, say the authors of a new report brought out by the Twentieth Century Fund.

PRIMITIVISM IN OUR DAY

By Arye Dvir

Undergraduate Student from Israel in Soil Sciences at the
University of California, Berkeley

Having recently become acquainted with the role given the Indian citizens in the United States, I cannot help but ask myself whether it has been right—in view of their plight as it now exists—ever to have tried to convert these people to the ways of Western people: I have tried to consider how happy they would be had they been permitted to hold to their simple way of living. Would they now really prefer the "Ford"? Or the donkey? Would they enjoy hearing Beethoven conducted by Toscanini more than their own friends' playing the flute and the tom-tom in their monotonous rhythm?

These thoughts about the abject Indian lead one to consider the case of the citizens of the World who are in a similar plight today.

Suppose a man who lived among his brother natives for the first period of his life, and later moved to a great city where he changed all his customs, is asked where he spent the best time of his life. Often he would answer that the first period was the fullest and most beautiful. Often such simple people do not know which offered portions of the Western culture they must adopt. The Indians mentioned above, one notes, found the greatest use for Western weapons and for alcoholic drinks. The result of the use of these weapons has been his near extermination; the result of these drinks has been nothing less than his own deterioration and degeneration.

A rich and famous Arab Sheik living in Israel has recently found that possessing a new "Cadillic" is the most important of the West's contributions to his standard of living, but his tens of wives and unknown numbers of children still live in a primitive way which an American would not expect to find in the twentieth century. In primitive countries one may often meet a certain type of man who is very well dressed and who looks like a businessman from Wall Street, but this man still thinks that washing his body which hides beneath the suit has to be done only on special occasions such as at Ramadan or marriage.

Each nation and tribe, whether primitive or European or otherwise, has its own way of living; its life is well-balanced. There is a complete harmony among all its essential factors. The music and the dances fit the people's character; the building and archi-

ecture are a result of the climatic conditions and esthetic taste; the art is a function of the national motives. When one of these factors is changed, all the balance is disturbed. Then instead of harmony there is great disharmony. So, when "boogy-woogy" is heard in a Tibetan native's tent, one will surely find it standing in sharp conflict with the total background.

A thinking man knows that just the details of Western culture such as dress and music by themselves do not add anything to the improvement of primitive nations. On the other hand, we are convinced that it is impossible to stop history, hold a culture static, and keep a nation living in the same way as it did thousands of years ago. Further, one finds it to be a very cruel fact that some people in a nation even as civilized as the United States want to keep the Indians in closed areas as a national monument just as they keep the native bears in Yellowstone Park.

So what, then, is the solution to this problem, this paradox with which we find ourselves confronted? The trouble with the primitivism of our day is not found in the fact that the Tibetan's song sounds terrible in our ears, and not that the Negroes in Africa believe in many gods of wood and stone: not even that most of the Arabs don't know how to sign their own name. The crux of the trouble lies in the cold fact that seven of ten Arab children still will die before they finish their fifth year, and that in India people of different sects will refuse to cooperate in building the New India. No, in these situations no "Cadillacs" and no evening dresses will help. Nor will even changing the name of the god lead us to the attainment of our goal. There man himself must help: a teacher, a nurse or a doctor, sometimes a missionary, or just a simple man with an open heart and the desire to help. These people will teach the natives how to keep clean, how to fight the flies, and how to feed their children. Only later, after these first crying needs of human living are met, will the native be taught how to write and how to pray.

The fortunate among us who are able to meet our own needs will be primitive in our ways and derelict in our obligation to man until the day when we leave our silk-lined litter and come to the aid of those less fortunate.

* * *

The pathway to success is in serving humanity. By no other means is it possible, and this truth is so plain and patent that even very simple folk recognize it.—E. Hubbard.

NEWS AND VIEWS

RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

An example of the direction in which we should be pointing is given when we look at an address given by Rabbi Ira E. Sanders of Temple B'nai Israel speaking last November 18th before the Rotary Club of Little Rock, Ark. This Jewish leader said, speaking on the subject of "This I Believe"—"The earth is the only place to fix our fancy. The physical heaven of pagan fancy and the heathen hell of fire and brimstone manufactured out of hatred and fear, are both as unreal and unnatural as the 'happy hunting ground' of the Indian or the warm place in the earth pictured by the Eskimos."

He continued, "I believe in Man's search for enduring values, religions developed many creeds and established many altars. Religion is as old as humanity, but it is altogether human. No one Bible contains all the truth. They are valuable only as they portray the ethical and religious revolution."

Rabbi Sanders believes in the separation of church and state and that "no church doctrine, religious theory or scripture should be required by law to be read in our schools to the exclusion of other theories. I am therefore opposed to the reading of Bibles, both the Hebrew and the Christian version, as a required part of public school exercises even as I am opposed to legislation in the name of any religion against the teaching of science or philosophy in public educational agencies."

"We cease to live when we cease to think" said the Rabbi, and that he believed in the "evolutionary concept of the universe and the earth"—holding that they were brought into being by "natural processes."

Part of an article by the Rev. James W. McKnight, Hutchinson, Kansas, published in the Hutchinson News Herald, March 27, 1955.

* * *

THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament consists of a small part of the writings that were produced by the new religion that came to be called Christianity. Many of the early writings have been the new religion that came to be called Christianity. Many of the early writings have been lost or were not considered worthy of preservation. There remains more materials that did not get into the N.T. than did. My notion is that the N. T. collection is representative and is rather above the average. Unlike the Old Testament that took

about nine centuries in its making, the N. T. was dashed off in about one hundred years (50 A.D. - 150 A.D.). It is divided into 27 sections called "books." Like the O. T. the titles tell us nothing reliable as to authorship. The books were tracts for the times. They were written to win friends and influence people. Yet they exhibit theological diversity. Each seeks to gain adhesions to definite theological ideas. People have been confused because they have approached the N. T. with the notion that Christianity began as a full-blown theological system and that that system was set forth consistently in all parts. When a person speaks of Christianity he may mean almost anything. Christianity is a culture containing many opposing theologies. In the N. T. there are many contradictory doctrines.

As with the O. T. there are no original manuscripts extant. All we have are copies of copies of copies. All the books have been changed by editing, translation, deliberate revisions, and errors in copying. By the time printing was discovered in Europe in 1454, thus making permanence and uniformity possible, the text had progressively become corrupt. The earliest complete copy of the N.T. is 4th century A.D. Greek, and is a comparatively recent discovery. It shows a large number of discrepancies with what we have been calling the N.T.

A large part of the N.T. consists of the letters of Paul, an apostate Jew who had absorbed many religious ideas of the Hellenistic world. He wrote nine or ten of the books (Ephesians is in dispute) from about 50 A.D. to 60 A.D.

There are three biographies of Jesus that show remarkable likeness even to parallel language. They are called "synoptic gospels." Gospel means "good news." They were written from about 70 A.D. to 90 A.D. They represent a different religion from that of Paul's letters. They bear the names respectively of Mark, Matthew and Luke, but no one knows anything about the authors.

Then there is one example of the queer frenzied symbolic writing called apocalypticism. The writer appears to be a paranoid with delusions of persecution and grandeur as well. This is the book called Revelation. Its religion shows little resemblance to the other types of Christianity in the N.T.

There is a history of the early church called Acts, partly fiction, of composite but unknown authorship. Also there are minor writings of unknown authors but bearing the names of disciples of Jesus. These disciples probably could not have written Greek,

and the ideas presented are not those native to the religious culture of Jesus. One called Hebrews is of some literary merit, and sets forth a theology different than that of any other book of the N.T.

A philosophic biography called John completes the list. It was written the first part of the second century by an unknown who was seeking to bring all the disparate and warring conceptions of Christianity under one big tent. I guess he didn't miss many but it is a menagerie with all the animals a-roar rather than the smooth show he intended.

—Harold Scott, in Ram's Horn

* * *

CALIF. COURT DECIDES OATH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Loyalty oaths required in California to obtain certain property tax exemptions were ruled unconstitutional in mid-February by the five-man State Superior Court of Contra Costa County. More than two million war veterans and thousands of non-profit organizations, including churches, are affected by the decision. However, the State is expected to appeal the ruling.

The test case was brought by Lawrence Speiser, a World War II veteran and Staff Counsel for the ACLU's Northern California Branch.

The court found that the loyalty oath amendment to the State Constitution, adopted in 1952, violates the free speech guarantees of the Federal Constitution. It also declared unconstitutional an implementing statute passed by the state legislature in 1953. This requires that any person or organization applying for a property tax exemption must sign an accompanying loyalty statement.

* * *

ACLU STILL OPPOSED TO UMT LEGISLATION

In mid-March, the ACLU announced its opposition to the proposed Universal Military Training bill, declaring that it "would create a spirit of militarism hostile to democratic liberties." The Union's statement, filed with the House Armed Services Committee, reiterated the traditional ACLU position stating that UMT would "prepare the way psychologically for totalitarian practices and become accepted as a regular feature of education, even in times of peace."

On the other hand, Executive Director Patrick Murphy Malin noted that the Union did not oppose the original draft law in

1940, and that in view of the current danger to national security, "it lies beyond the competence of the ACLU in the name of freedom now to oppose measures for Selective Service, which in earlier emergencies it has accepted."

However, Malin urged on Congress that everything be done to make it clear that Selective Service is an emergency measure, and asked that the present law be revised "to give more generous protection to the rights of conscience. The sincerity of conscientious objectors should not be judged by the test of a religious formula so narrow as to exclude ethical or humanistic beliefs."

* * *

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

It is kind of you to intend to announce in the Humanist World Digest our plan concerning a humanistically oriented new university. While many humanists participate in this project, the planned University of Unified Knowledge (a temporary name which may change in the name of a large sponsor) is directed by a Board of Trustees who are academic people and intellectuals, and who are independent of any commitment except the aims and purposes of the university itself.

We intend to start with about 10 professors and 50 students in the first year. General cultural background plus the preparation for specialization is the main aim. In the student's accomplishments (when he graduates) there will be an integrated knowledge of his world—the social, physical, scientific, artistic, etc.—in order to enable him not to be a mere specialist but also a thorough human being who will have a clear picture of how his own duties and social participation fits into the general progress of mankind. He will have, therefore, the feeling of social responsibility. This is so especially because character development would be also a part of the curriculum. But, of course, dogmatism of any kind will not.

Before graduation, the students, for whom class work would be only a part of the work, would be required to go out to take jobs in their fields at least for half a year and bring their experiences back to the university (also to tell us what was wrong with our method of teaching.) Beside all this, the students would be engaged in work projects with the professors, as well as in special experimental work. Student and teacher would work together in close contact and friendship.

Enclosed is a copy of our project which will not start before an essential part of the needed money is available. We need at least 3 million dollars; 300 thousand is tentatively promised, also large acreage is offered.

With best regards and best wishes in your work,
D. M. Morandini,

Los Angeles

Dear Sir:

The Board of Directors of the Washington State Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union by resolution on March 22nd has authorized this letter in order that the public have a comprehensive account in regard to the J. Robert Oppenheimer dispute at the University of Washington.

Dr. Henry Schmitz, President of the University of Washington, vetoed a unanimous recommendation by the department of physics and the Walker-Ames Committee to bring Dr. Oppenheimer to the university as a Walker-Ames visiting professor, for the purpose of offering a week's series of lectures and seminars on theoretical physics. Pres. Schmitz explained his decision on the grounds that "bringing him (Oppenheimer) here at this time would not be in the best interests of the university." Later, he announced that his decision was based upon a careful evaluation of Oppenheimer's "governmental relations."

Dr. Oppenheimer's security clearance was withdrawn last Spring after a controversial hearing by the Atomic Energy Commission, but the Commission specifically found that he was a "loyal citizen." We of the ACLU Board, at the time of Pres. Schmitz's decision took the view that, on the contrary, the refusal to extend an invitation to Oppenheimer was not "in the best interests of the university." Our stand at this time was shared emphatically by numerous members of the faculty, student groups, and campus religious leaders.

By resolution adopted at a Board meeting of March 22, we reiterate that stand and call attention to the unfortunate fact that the decision on Oppenheimer has proved not to be "in the best interests of the university." Already, nearly a dozen distinguished scholars have made public their refusal to visit the university because of this violation of academic freedom. Harvard historian, Dr. Perry Miller, in refusing, said, "This action seems to be not only an egregious insult to a great scholar, but also a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of intel-

lectual integrity and liberty of spirit upon which the education system of a free society is erected." Dr. Victor A. Weisskopf, professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said in declining his invitation, "No self-respecting physicist could come here after the refusal to invite Dr. Oppenheimer to speak. As long as the refusal stands, I myself would never accept any invitation to Seattle." Dr. Alex Inkeles, Harvard sociologist, wrote that he considered the Oppenheimer decision "counter to the basic values and democratic practices of our country." Inkeles' letter said that the University of Washington academic community has "been denied one of its basic rights." He said that he felt acceptance of an appointment at the University of Washington would indicate his agreement with the Oppenheimer decision.

A conference under the auspices of the University of Washington biochemistry department, planned for April 7-8, has been cancelled as a direct result of the Oppenheimer decision. The eight scientists who had been scheduled to speak at the meeting have now refused to participate. The conference, the most important such meeting in the history of the biochemistry department, was expected to attract over 300 biological scientists. A round-robin letter, signed by seven of the eight scholars scheduled to speak, said that their refusal was based upon Schmitz's Oppenheimer decision. Their letter to Dr. Schmitz said in part, "it seems to us that you have clearly placed the University of Washington outside the community of scholars." The scientists who signed the letter are: Robert A. Alberty, associate professor of chemistry, University of Wisconsin; Konrad Bloch, professor of biochemistry, Harvard; David E. Green, professor of enzyme chemistry, and Henry A. Lardy, professor of biochemistry, both of the University of Wisconsin; Arthur Kornberg, professor of microbiology, Washington University, St. Louis; William H. Stein, a member of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, and Bert L. Vallee, a member of the biophysics research laboratory at Harvard University. The eighth scientist, Charles S. Hanes, professor of biochemistry at the University of Toronto, indicated his refusal to participate in the conference on similar grounds.

It should be clear, therefore, that the Oppenheimer decision has been the cause of the loss of service of excellent teachers and scholars and of a general loss of prestige by the University of Washington in the academic community of the nation.

However, when teachers are denied academic freedom the encroachment on liberty is not limited to the particular institution involved; the community and the entire country suffer as well.

Aron S. Gilmartin, Chairman,
R. Boland Brooks, Executive Secy.
For the Board of Directors

My Dear Friend Corson:

Thank you for your letter of February 8, with the information which I requested. I shall attempt to get HWD placed on at least 2 newsstands here, and I do not believe that I shall have much difficulty. They now carry AHA's "HUMANIST" by my request and I feel certain that they will carry HWD.

There is much interest, passing though it may be, in Humanism in Providence at this time. The local newspapers carried full stories of the British psychiatrist's Humanist radio broadcasts, which brought the newspapers many requests for information and Humanism. They forwarded many of the requests to us. In my letters of information I recommended that the inquirer subscribe to HWD.

To show how great the interest is, we have, at last, been able to break into print with the enclosed letter which appeared in the February 3 Providence Journal and the Evening Bulletin. While the issue is still "hot," I believe it should be exploited, for the sake of Humanism:

PLEDGE LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL

I note in the Bulletin of Jan. 25 that the State of Rhode Island is to put God in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. May I ask which God?

Is it to be the God of the Christians? If so, then this is the establishment of religion which the First Amendment to the Constitution prohibits. It is discrimination against the Jews, Moslems, and Hindus. It is inconceivable that the god to be put into the flag pledge is one of the hundreds of "pagan" gods.

Do not atheists have the protection of the U. S. Constitution? Must they and their children be forced to invoke the help of a God that they do not believe in?

What about Humanists, who are neither supernaturalists nor atheists? We have rights under the Constitution and we demand those rights. I shall not, and all Humanists that I know and work

with will not ever "pledge allegiance to "one nation under God." Our children will not, and consequently will be discriminated against in the public schools. Isn't there enough discrimination in the schools without adding more?

The proposed state law and the federal law putting God in the flag pledge is open and willful contempt of the constitutional laws of the United States, and is governmental propaganda intended falsely to infer that this is a Christian nation and to influence people toward religion per se, thereby constituting a deliberately contrived and unlawful act of assistance to religion.

This country's 1797 treaty with Tripoli stated, "The government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded upon the Christian religion."

With thanks for your kind cooperation, I remain your friend and co-worker,

Dr. Phillip B. Oliver, Leader,
The Peoples Humanist and Ethical Society

Dear Friend:

Let us thank you for your kind letter, October 27, and for "Humanist World Digest" of November, where you have reproduced our leaflet "On Religious League."

It is indeed good to find people in other countries that are traveling along similar roads. So you say according with our feelings; and we add, that it is better to find friends who are prompt to collaborate in the cause of Humanity. Thank you very much.

We have been in contact latterly with the Humanists in England: Mr. Henry Lloyd is the Hon. Secretary of the Humanist Council in this country and a most enthusiastic worker for Humanism. He sent us the address of the International Humanist and Ethical Union with headquarters at Oranje-Nassaulaan 50, Amsterdam-Z, Holland.

Recently we have written to Dr. Edwin H. Wilson, University of Chicago, because of an article of him that we read in the "Radical Humanist" of Calcutta, India. There he gives a very interesting account of Humanism in the United States.

We consider very good "the ideals of Humanism" and the "ten aims of Humanist World Fellowship" you are publishing, and also your "Interpreting Humanist Objectives." We have enjoyed all the articles of your magazine so we hope to receive it always in exchange of our publications.

Let us tell you something about our "Fundación Juan Enrique Lagarrigue" and its aims. It was founded in order to maintain the benefit of the Lagarrigue spiritual works; they were three brothers who gave themselves up to the study and propagation of the Religion of Humanity, during 75 years, without interruption, from 1874 when Jorge went to Paris till the death of Luis in 1949. They were faithful Comte's disciples and they spent their lives in the study, the meditation and propagation of Positivism. We are reprinting pages of their philosophical, social and religious writings; we send them all over the world and we are glad when some friends, like you, are so kind to answer us.

We are very near, on feelings and thoughts, with the Humanists; only that most of them shun the word "Religion." It appears to me that you are more close to us, in that way.

It is sad that I cannot send you the "Catechisme Positiviste" of Auguste Comte, because we have only two exemplaries of its English translation here in the library of the "Fundación Juan Enrique Lagarrigue." We have made our best to obtain more copies of this splendid work but none was to be found, neither in England where its three editions were published. I think that this book of our Master should find there an enthusiastic acceptance because of the religious spirit we observe in many people in the United States. On reading the ideals, aims and objectives of Humanism that you publish in your magazine I remark its analogy with some beautiful pages of Auguste Comte, always in the inner conception of religiousness.

Let me send you some quotations of the "Catechism of Positive Religion," translated by Richard Cangreve, third edition, 1891. On the word "Religion:" page 34:

"In itself, it expresses the state of perfect UNITY, which is distinctive of our existence, both individual and social, when all its parts, moral as well as physical, habitually converge toward a common purpose . . . Religion, then, consists in REGULATING each individual nature, and in RALLYING all the separate individuals; which are but two distinct cases of one problem."

(Page 35) "There is, at bottom, but one religion, at once universal and final, to which all the partial and provisional synthesis more and more pointed, so far as their respective conditions allowed."

Perhaps positivists over the world must unite themselves to publish another edition of this book in English. I feel that many peoples are awaiting for it, to gather important teachings, and

peace and harmony for hearts and minds.

Please excuse my retard in answering your letter and the gift of your magazine. I hope that a more regular intercourse will follow by and by, in the interest and the increase of our ideals.

Ida Colombo de Lagarrigue

Santiago, Chile

EDITORIAL NOTES

Publishing the Humanist World Digest and carrying on other activities of the Humanist World Fellowship entails quite a bit of expense. Now that we are rapidly extending our efforts to promote truth and human fulfillment, we need your help. Much of our work is done voluntarily, but the costs of mailings, etc., constantly increases. Every small contribution will help. Contributions made to the Humanist World Fellowship are, of course, tax deductible.

Let us know if you wish to have information about becoming a member of the H.W.F.

Those who wish to include the Humanist World Fellowship in their wills may care to the use following

FORM OF BEQUEST

I give and bequeath to the Humanist World Fellowship, a corporation established for religious and educational purposes under the non-profit laws of the State of California, the sum of
..... Dollars
to be known as the (insert name) Fund to be used to promote the work of the Fellowship.

SUGGESTED READING

We do not have these books for sale here. Order them from your local book store or request your library to obtain them if they are not on the shelves:

"Living as a Humanist," Essays by H. J. Blackham, Virginia Flemming, Ursula Edgecombe and M. L. Burnet. Chatterson Ltd., 5 Johnson's Court, London, England.

"One Woman's Fight," Vashti McCollum, Beacon Press, Boston.

"Humanism As the Next Step," Lloyd & Mary Morain, Beacon Press.

"The Irish and Catholic Power," Paul Blanchard, Beacon Press.

"The Preacher and I," Charles Francis Potter, Crown Publishers, New York.

"Humanism as a Philosophy," Corliss LaMont, Phil. Library.

GOOD NEIGHBOR MAILBAG

Many readers have written to us to express their desire for correspondence with other Humanists. Beginning with the next issue we will print the names and addresses of those subscribers who wish to be listed on our Humanist Correspondence page. This is a good way to establish interesting contacts with others of similar beliefs from near and far.

REPRINTS

"The Answer in Greece," a reprint of Walter Packard's article telling how he enabled the Greek people to feed themselves for the first time since the advent of Christianity.—10c.

"The Essence of Humanism," two addresses delivered by two signers of the Humanist Manifesto. Dr. John H. Dietrich: "Humanism, Its Background and Meaning." Dr. Eldred C. Vanderlaan: "Humanism As a Faith or Philosophy."—15c.

Address: Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz avenue, Berkeley, Calif.

IDEALS TO LIVE BY

"Teach men not to sacrifice this world for some other, but to turn their attention to the natural, to the affairs of this life. Teach them that theology has no known foundation, that it was born of ignorance and fear, that it has hardened the heart, polluted the imagination and made fiends of man. . . .

"Theology is not for this world. It is no part of real religion. It has nothing to do with goodness or virtue. Religion does not consist of worshipping gods, but in adding to the well-being, the happiness of man. No human being knows whether any god exists or not, and all that has been said and written about "our god" or the gods of other people has no known fact for a foundation. Words without thoughts, clouds without rain. . . .

"Let us put theology out of religion." —Robert Ingersoll

The lay press has lately given extensive news coverage, run pictures of riots and peaceful mass demonstrations, and even extended its editorial comment to the struggles going on between church and state over the schools in Argentina, Belgium, and West Germany. The disorder in Brussels and other Belgian cities climaxed a strike of almost a million children in the church schools of that country. These cases of turmoil finally and inevitably turn up wherever you find a breakdown in the "wall of separation" between church and state. In the First Amendment our founders showed an uncanny gift for prophecy.

THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S COLUMN

Keep in your heart a shrine to the ideal, and upon this altar let the fire never die.

A child does not need a religion until he is old enough to evolve one, and then he must not be robbed of the right of independent thinking by having a fully prepared plan of salvation handed out to him.—Elbert Hubbard.

Each copy of OUR magazine is a missionary into a world where organized ignorance rules. \$1 pays the cost of a missionary for one year.

Why not send gift subscriptions to your friends and local public libraries?

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for years at \$1 per year. (check).

(Add gift subscriptions on separate sheet)

MEMBERSHIP FORM (Dues include a subscription to the Humanist World Digest).

I wish to apply for membership in the Humanist World Fellowship and enclose \$..... to cover annual dues, as indicated. (Check one)

() \$5 Regular. () \$10 Contributing.

() \$25 Sustaining. () \$100 or more, Sponsor.

Total amount enclosed: \$.....

NAME.....
(Please type or print)

ADDRESS

Mail to: HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST
1011 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley 2, California

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP defines religion in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

HUMANISM insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principle of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST WORLD FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.

Starr King Ministerial College
University of California
Berkeley, Calif. (K)